

**CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
CHANDIGARH BENCH
CHANDIGARH**

O.A. No.060/01151/14

Decided on: 24.12.2014

**Coram: Hon'ble Mr. Sanjeev Kaushik, Member (J)
Hon'ble Mr. Uday Kumar Varma, Member (A)**

Monika Bansal(earlier Monika Mittal) aged about 40 years wife of Capt. Sandeep Bansal, Advocate, House No. 568, Sector 16-D, Chandigarh.

.....Applicant

Versus

1. Union of India through Secretary Home, North Block, New Delhi.
2. Union Territory Chandigarh through Adviser to Administrator, Chandigarh.
3. The State Project Director, Sarva Shiksha Abhiyan Society (UT) Additional Deluxe Building, Sector 9, Chandigarh.
4. DPI (Schools), Deluxe Building, Sector 9, Chandigarh.

.....Respondents

Present: Mr. Dhiraj Chawla, counsel for the applicant

Order (Oral)

By Hon'ble Mr. Sanjeev Kaushik, Member(J)

1. By means of the present O.A., the applicant has sought issuance of a direction to the respondents to consider her claim for appointment against the post of TGT Gen Science (NM) under the ESM quota.

2. Learned counsel submits that the persons junior to her in merit have been selected under the ESM quota and all the vacancies under this quota have not been filled till date. He further submits that the applicant has already filed a representation dated 10.06.2014 (Annexure A-11) requesting the respondents to consider her claim but the same has not been decided till date. He makes a statement at the Bar that the applicant would be satisfied if the O.A. is disposed of with a direction to the respondents to consider and take a view on her representation within a time-bound manner.
3. Considering that the applicant is simply asking for a direction to the respondents to decide her pending representation, there is no need to issue notice to the respondents and call for their reply. Also no prejudice shall be caused to the respondents due to non-issuance of notice as they have not yet decided the representation of the applicant which they are supposed to do within a period of six months as per Section 20 of the Administrative Tribunal Act, 1985.
4. Accordingly, the O.A. is disposed of, with a direction to the respondents to consider the representation dated 10.06.2014 (Annexure A-11) in accordance with Law and instructions on the



subject, by passing a speaking and reasoned order within a period of two months from the date of receipt of a copy of this order.

5. Needless to say that we have not commented on the merits of the case.
6. No costs.

(UDAY KUMAR VARMA)
MEMBER (A)

(SANJEEV KAUSHIK)
MEMBER (J)

PLACE: Chandigarh
Dated: 24.12.2014

`mw'